

### REMARKS

There are now pending in this application Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19 and 21, of which Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Claims 4, 12 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice or waiver of their subject matter. No new claims have been added.

Drawings 2 and 5 stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference characters not mentioned in the description. Drawing 5 stands further objected to as not being identified as prior art under MPEP § 608.02(g).

The specification stands objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter of Claims 5, 6, 8, 10 and 19-21 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, particularly the lack of an unambiguous antecedent basis for “the transporting vacuum chamber” component of Claim 20.

Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 17 stand rejected under 25 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 7,033,721 B2 (Hashizume, et al.). Furthermore, Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,512,510 (Murayama, et al.).

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that Dependent Claims 2, 4, 11-16, 18, 19 and 21 were indicated by the Examiner as containing patentable subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the above application is respectfully sought.

Applicants submit herewith replacement sheets for Figures 2 and 5. These replacement sheets make corrections to the drawings which address each of the grounds of objection to the drawings identified on pages 2 and 3 of the outstanding Official Action. In view of those amendments to the replacement drawings, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the objections to the drawings has been addressed and those objections should now be withdrawn.

Applicants have also amended the specification to correct a discrepancy between Table 26 on page 80 and the text describing that table at page 80, lines 2-5.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 5 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o), Applicants direct Examiner's attention to page 57, lines 9-10 of the specification, which discloses that the reactors should optimally be changed between 1 to 5 times. Because the reactor is changed between 1 to 5 times, between 2 to 6 layers will be formed in the thickness direction (i.e., when the reactor is changed for the first time, a first layer will already have been formed and a second will be formed before the process is complete, when the reactor is changed for the second time, two layers will exist and a third will be formed, etc.).

Applicants have amended Claims 6 and 8 in line with the Examiner's observation on pages 3 and 4 of the outstanding Office Action that the specification discloses a "blocking layer."

With regard to the rejection of Claim 10 as lacking an antecedent basis in the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is supported by the disclosure on page 86, line 33 to page 87, line 8 of the specification, which states that "... according to the process of the present invention ... the following steps are carried out: ... a step of taking out of the reactor the cylindrical support on which a photoconductive layer region has been deposited to move it to a different reactor."

Regarding the rejection of Claims 19-21 as lacking antecedent bases in the specification, Applicants respectfully submit that Example 12, including tables 26 and 27, starting on page 79, line 20 and ending on page 81, line 35 of the present specification adequately supports the subject matter recited in Claims 19-21.

The rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been resolved by cancellation of the claim without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter presented therein.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3, 5-10 and 17, variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of either Hashizume, et al. or Murayama, et al., now stand in condition for allowance. Sole Independent Claims 1 and 9, the parent claims for each of the other aforementioned claims,

have been amended to include the subject matter of Dependent Claims 4 and 12, respectively, which the Examiner has indicated as being patentable subject matter.

For the forgoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 9, as now amended, are neither taught nor suggest by the applied reference.

The remaining claims in the above application are dependent claims which depend either directly or indirectly from one of the above-discussed independent claims and are therefore patentable over the art of record for reasons noted above with respect to the independent claims. In addition, each recite features of the invention still further distinguishing it from the applied art. Favorable and independent consideration thereof is respectfully sought.

Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding matters in the above application have been addressed and that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the above application are respectfully sought.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lawrence A Stahl/

---

Lawrence A. Stahl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 30,110

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

LAS:eyw

DC\_MAIN 247507v1